

Date: Mon, 17 May 93 14:06:13 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #147  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Mon, 17 May 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 147

Today's Topics:

    If you didn't get a copy of the CFV...  
        More on no-code (2 msgs)  
        Morse et cetera... (3 msgs)  
        RE: sick of it all

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 17 May 93 05:25:15 GMT  
From: amdahl!amdahl!ikluft@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: If you didn't get a copy of the CFV...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I mentioned a couple days ago that I made a mail server for the CFV since a  
number of people asked me for copies. I sent out a bunch of them manually  
and then set up this server. Well... it worked fine when I tested it. :-(  
There was a setup error that resulted in this output for everyone but me:

>--copy of CFV-----  
>[the mailer script was not able to open this file]  
>-----

Needless to say, that isn't even an abridged version of it! I've fixed the  
error. (The directory permissions were accidentally set so it would only work  
if \*I\* sent mail to it. I hate it when that happens!)

It will work now. If you want a copy of the CFV, as posted by the moderator



: >Ridiculous argument #1:  
: >If you want to discuss a topic you must PROVE that your idea will not  
: >cause increased band crowding.  
:  
: This is a longstanding framework of forensics. The existing system always  
: has the benefit of the doubt, while new policy must demonstrate both  
: advantage and lack of disadvantage.

Advantage: Will bring more individuals interested in promoting the goals  
of amateur radio into the hobby. For a list of the goals of amateur radio  
see part 97.1

Disadvantage: Since the one you mentioned isn't valid I'll pick my own.  
The inclusion of a CW exam for upgrading one's license brings  
proportionally more individuals with disregard for the rules into hamdom.  
Well I can say that I have not seen where a technician without code is any  
worse an operator than other hams. This could be studied, to some degree,  
by reviewing the number of NAL's issued and breaking it down into the  
license class of the violator. Just compare the proportion of no-codes  
cited to the proportion of each other class.

: >Ridiculous argument #2:  
: >The implied argument that the bands are not currently over crowded. They  
: >are overcrowded at certain times at not at other times.  
:  
: You've just granted me that we are at or near capacity. You then argue:

And I've just layed a purple egg, right?!?!? No, they are at some times  
and not at others. That's as silly as saying that since 2m in the  
Sacramento Valley is dead most of the time. Most repeaters are  
transmitting less than 3 hours a day. (example don't ask for citation)  
That the no codes use less spectrum.

>The same way it will be if the code requirement is dropped/relaxed. :  
: There is every reason to believe that this is not true. People who are not  
: trained in CW will not use it (if you're saying that they would, then little  
: is lost by requiring it). Other modes require more spectrum, particularly  
: SSB, which uses 25x the spectrum of CW. Finally, you'd automatically increase  
: the band population by a factor of at least two. Given that you've conceded  
: we are at or near the limit, the result would be overload and interference.  
Hopefully the result would be the development of more efficient modes.  
The reason voice is used so often is the effective use of time per unit of  
information. Time is as valuable a resource as spectrum, at least you can  
reuse spectrum. I know, 200 wpm is only 10X more throughput than 20wpm.  
But the value to the operator outweighs the 2.5:1 advantage of morse for  
many operators. Yes people who are not TESTED in CW may well use it. I  
never said trained I said tested. Not all of them will though. And  
little will change for those who do use it. But it will open up our hobby

to a number of people who would otherwise not join. This in turn will help build and maintain a pool of qualified communicators (see part 97.1)

:  
: >But seriously I meant that the arguments that we need CW to keep out the riff  
: >raff, call for help when our airplane crashes etc. are ridiculous and I was  
: >using you in the plural.  
:  
: We're in complete agreement there; those *\*are\** ridiculous arguments. As such,  
: I haven't supported such arguments. In painting with such a broad brush,  
: you've prejudged me.  
I apologize for including you in above group.

: >Since I haven't been on the 'net for nine years I have no idea what JSMADS  
: >means.  
:  
: The Jack Schmidling Memorial Ad Hominem Scale, so named for one of USEnet's  
: most legendary slingers of slurs.

I didn't realize you meant to not only impress me with your vast knowledge but to also to suggest that I was trying to attack you personally, and poorly at that. I meant that you're showing elitist views and I took you to be practicing what you preach. Which means that you act on the same elitist ideals which you espouse. If you don't act like an elitist then you obviously aren't one. You are therefore simply someone who espouses one belief and then act upon a different belief. I therefore withdraw my accusation of elitist and suggest hypocrite as a replacement. Ad hominem refers to attacking one's character, I meant to attack your opinions and writings if these don't reflect your character whose fault is that?

:  
: >It must really kill you that I'm part of the same favored group as you.  
:  
: I'm not too sure what this is supposed to mean, especially since I filed  
: comments in favor of the NPRM that led to the creation of a code-free entry  
: level license. Your prejudices are showing.

I was not referring to anyone's license class. It is not relevant how you felt about no-code license class (though it is nice to know you supported it. Thanks) I was referring to the fact that I, a person in favor of reviewing the current license structure, am a member of your elite little (if you get your way) group. Your assumption that I am a no-code technician merely sows your prejudices. :

: >Please tell me how a large number of spectrum users is equivalent to an

: >overcrowded movie theatre. I think I'll move my fire extinguisher closer  
: >to my '530. :-)  
: >Please make that ridiculous argument #4  
:  
: Overcrowding historically has lead to interference. Examples include the  
: mediumwave broadcast band debacle of the mid 1920's under the Commerce  
: Department, the 27 MHz citizen's band debacle that continues to this day,  
: and the current international problem with shortwave broadcasting allocations,  
: to name a few.

An overcrowded movie theatre causes interference? I guess I'll let that  
one go.

: >Why is CW proficiency a better way to prove a willingness to learn than  
: >say... requiring a college degree?  
:  
: Because it's directly relevant to the problem being addressed, namely,  
: spectrum scarcity.

Again, That is not the problem. Another way to limit the spectrum use  
would be to require all hams that can copy 20wpm+ to only operate CW since  
morse code at 5wpm is a waste of bandwidth (40X slower than ssb) and  
therefore give anyone who can only copy 5wpm voice on HF. Is that the  
answer to spectrum scarcity you want? Or only those who CAN use the  
spectrum more efficiently should be able to waste it?

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102              *
*                    Davis CA 95616                            *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

-----

Date: Mon, 17 May 93 17:40:07 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!  
nnntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: More on no-code  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C75F8n.H1x@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd)

writes:

>Perhaps in other services but not in the amateur service.

The Communications Act of 1934 and its amendments apply to all the services under the auspices of the FCC.

>They don't even license stations in the amateur service anymore, let alone  
> transmitters.

While the FCC no longer requests or prints a station address, the license still consists of an operator license, and a station license. The callsign, in fact, is associated with the station, not the operator.

>In fact transmitters don't even have to be type certified much less  
>individually licensed.

Actually, yes, transmitters sold by vendors must meet certain requirements which are not in Part 97, which apply to all transmitting equipment sold in the US. Even for homebrew, however, technical standards do exist in Part 97.

>Advantage: Will bring more individuals interested in promoting the goals  
>of amateur radio into the hobby. For a list of the goals of amateur radio  
>see part 97.1

Given that this is already happening, your advantage is not unique. This is the reason for having a codeless introductory license.

>Disadvantage: Since the one you mentioned isn't valid I'll pick my own.

Elaborate. How have you shown that removing the requirement won't lead to overcrowding of the HF bands, and result in interference?

>The inclusion of a CW exam for upgrading one's license brings  
>proportionally more individuals with disregard for the rules into hamdom.

Now, we had agreed that CW or lack thereof has no bearing on character. Would you now like to reopen that discussion?

>And I've just laid a purple egg, right?!?!? No, they are at some times  
>and not at others. That's as silly as saying that since 2m in the  
>Sacramento Valley is dead most of the time. Most repeaters are  
>transmitting less than 3 hours a day. (example don't ask for citation)

We're in absolute agreement here; the VHF and UHF spectra are underutilized. Thus, some move to increase growth was warranted, namely the codeless introductory level license. But \*none\* of this applies to HF.

>That the no codes use less spectrum.

Narrowband FM occupies from 15-20 kHz depending on deviation. CW is nominally less than 100 Hz wide. You're off by a few orders of magnitude.

>Hopefully the result would be the development of more efficient modes.

You havn't shown why that cannot take place now, nor have you shown that it \*isn't\*. CLOVER, for example, was developed under the current rules, and is probably as close to the Shannon bound as we are likely to see for some time.

>The reason voice is used so often is the effective use of time per unit of  
>information.

As I've said before, amateur message length is not transmission time independent.

>I apologize for including you in above group.

Likewise, Thanks for toning things down a bit.

>An overcrowded movie theatre causes interference? I guess I'll let that  
>one go.

It sure does if there's a fire. Mob panic is not pretty.

--

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."

->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, \_A Nation of Victims\_

-----

Date: 17 May 1993 02:36:17 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!

cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!joshua!jbromley@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Morse et cetera...

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2HsJ4B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

[semi-massive deletia]

>I don't believe in "incentive licensing." I feel our license structure is  
>based on personal need, and not everyone NEEDS to become an Extra. If you  
>want to talk on two meters, then there is the Codeless Technician. If you  
>want to chat on 75 meters, then the General Class is for you. I know of  
>one ham who, for the past decade, has held a Novice, and never upgraded.

>Why? All he wants to do is work CW on the Novice portion of 15 meters.

All I want to do is put a 1.5 kW PACTOR station on 40 meters. That is my total need. What license class do I need?

```
+-----+-----+
| Jim Bromley W5GYJ          |                               |
| 5128 N. 69th Ave          |   Celebrating 30 years as a No-Code Technician   |
| Glendale, AZ 85303        |                               |
| tel: 602-848-8711         |   Internet: jlbromley@sedona.intel.com             |
+-----+-----+
```

-----  
Date: Mon, 17 May 93 00:00:46 CDT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!  
zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!  
robert@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Morse et cetera...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:

> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:  
> :  
> : Is it that the Codeless Technician is not satisfactory to these  
> : individuals? It seems to me that the current privileges conferred by this  
> [Same argument duplicated three times with slight variation deleted]  
>  
> I'll type it real slowly for you this time, maybe you'll understand ;-)  
> It is not that all these people want to give more privileges to the  
> technician class license!!! The discussion is if we should try to change  
> the licensing requirements for higher license classes!! Most of the  
> people aren't arguing about the current technician class structure. The  
> discussion relates to other classes (ie. General, Advanced and Extra).  
>  
I would be very interested in knowing what class of amateur license YOU have, Dan. Rather than constantly complain about how unfair the current licensing structure is, wouldn't it be easier (and more productive) for you to simply upgrade through the amateur ranks? Wait...that's unfair too, isn't it. It requires EFFORT.

--Robert

-----  
Date: Mon, 17 May 1993 17:41:21 GMT  
From: agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@ames.arpa



Subject: Morse et cetera...

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

```
: >
: I would be very interested in knowing what class of amateur license YOU
: have, Dan. Rather than constantly complain about how unfair the current
: licensing structure is, wouldn't it be easier (and more productive) for
: you to simply upgrade through the amateur ranks? Wait...that's unfair
: too, isn't it. It requires EFFORT.
:
: --Robert
```

Easier, yes, more productive, no! Why does my license class make a difference in whether or not my opinion on the current license structure is the best we could construct? MY opinions are not dictated by my license class. That is like saying that a man has no reason to be interested in sexual equality or a whiteperson shouldn't care about race relations. This is not PC drive! these things are my beliefs. I would not be served by increasing the access to HF for technicians since I have no access to an HF rig (or more accurately antenna) at this time. What I'm trying to get you to understand is that whether I am a no-coder or an extra my beliefs would npt be any different.

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                      Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu             *
*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102            *
*                      Davis CA 95616                          *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

-----

Date: Sat, 15 May 1993 19:09:23 EST

From: anomaly.sbs.com!mooch!news@uunet.uu.net

Subject: RE: sick of it all

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

```
> Granting access to portions of the phone bands to someone because they can
> copy 20 WPM instead of 13 WPM or 13 WPM instead of 5 WPM seems a bit
```

> bizarre.

Maybe it's bizarre to someone who whines about how difficult the code is. The extra portion of the bands should be reserved for amateurs with reasonable technical and morse code prowess. If all the opponents of code put the effort they extol about fighting the code requirement into learning the code they'd be all set. Just get it done! Stop whining! Extra class amateur radio operators are supposed to "excel" in the radio art. Stop trying to water the hobby down. The lowest common denominator seems to be your goal.

> In addition I think most have "wanted" the written exams  
> substantially beefed up. I just checked out AUTOEXAM and discovered I can  
> pass element 4A without studying. That's ridiculous. In fact, I think  
> I've only "studied" for all the written elements a total of 4 hours and I  
> could possibly get lucky and pass 4B. So perhaps not giving the written  
> exam wouldn't be much different than it is today.

This is absolutely true. The exams prove nothing about competence. They only prove memorization skills. Yes we need more amateurs, but we don't need more incompetent amateurs. Exclusionary you say? No it is not. It a resource which we as are granted the privilege to use. People who work hard and strive for excellence should be the mainstay of the hobby not the LCD of our society.

> I haven't heard anyone advocate "giving" licenses away. Did you read that  
> somewhere? Let's evolve and encourage amateurs to learn something they can  
> use to improve the state of the art, not preserve the past. Amateur radio  
> is not a historical preservation society the last time I checked. This  
> isn't about making it "easier" it's about making it relevant.

Well spoken Todd. But I do believe Morse Code is still relevant. I guess that is the only area where our views diverge. But in a fundamental sense I would have to agree with you.

```
-----
- Christopher Ogren NM1Z          | The politically correct -
- system@mooch.sbs.com           | term for no-codes is   -
- AMPRnet: nm1z@switch.w1cg-9    | "Morsely Challenged". -
- [44.104.0.2]                   |                         -
- AX25net: NM1Z@KA1RCI.RI.USA.NA | MPD                    -
-----
```

-----  
Date: Mon, 17 May 1993 14:17:04 GMT  
From: swrinde!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May11.223649.1433@leland.Stanford.EDU>,  
<1993May13.073853.19940@ke4zv.uucp>, <1993May14.232317.29816@leland.Stanford.EDU>  
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)  
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May14.232317.29816@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu  
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

>In article <1993May13.073853.19940@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)  
writes:

>>Many used to sweat bullets when they had to \*lie\* on their  
>>renewal forms about still being able to copy Morse at their licensing  
>>requirement rate. Fortunately, the FCC deleted that question.

>

>So, are you saying that the number of phone operators would \*not\* go up if  
>the requirement was dropped? Remember, even if the proportions don't change  
>(and of course, they will), you're at least doubling the number of people  
>eligible to operate HF phone.

No, I'm not saying that at all. What I'm saying is that many of the  
amateurs \*currently\* on HF couldn't pass the code test at their license  
class speed anymore. I fully expect that if all US amateurs were allowed  
HF privileges, band occupancy would increase, at least for a while.  
That crowding could lead to innovative new techniques for sharing HF  
spectrum, or it could degenerate into on air flame wars. I prefer to  
view the former as worth any of the latter that may occur.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----

Date: Sat, 15 May 1993 19:45:31 EST  
From: anomaly.sbs.com!mooch!news@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May8.224811.15224@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,  
<Zuu03B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, <930509.230523.7v3.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>  
Reply-To : system@mooch.sbs.com  
Subject : Re: no-code defense

system@garlic.sbs.com (Anthony S. Pelliccio) writes:

>> Todd, please stop whining. Simply upgrade your class of amateur ticket,

>> and your problem is solved. We have gone over this ground again and  
>> again, and you are accomplishing nothing. If you spent just half the time  
>> working on your upgrade as you do pounding on your keyboard, you would  
>> have the class you desire, and this would be a moot argument.

>>

>> -Robert WA3J

>

> Wow.. all I can say is BRAVO, BRAVO! Take a bow!

>

> 73 de kd1nr... Tony

If that is not the truth...what is? Put an ounce of effort into morse  
code and you'd have it licked. But it is easier for you to complain.  
Again I realize that some people believe the LCD is what this hobby  
needs. What this hobby needs is capable amateurs not people who need an  
excuse for why they can't GET something. It's called work people.

And yes, I am glad this has moved over to policy. A more appropriate  
arena I say.

```
-----
- Christopher Ogren NM1Z          | The politically correct -
- system@mooch.sbs.com           | term for no-codes is   -
- AMPRnet: nm1z@switch.w1cg-9    | "Morsely Challenged". -
- [44.104.0.2]                   |                         -
- AX25net: NM1Z@KA1RCI.RI.USA.NA | MPD                    -
-----
```

-----  
Date: Mon, 17 May 93 17:44:51 GMT

From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!  
nnntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@ames.arpa

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May13.073853.19940@ke4zv.uucp> ,

<1993May14.232317.29816@leland.Stanford.EDU> ,

<1993May17.141704.9374@ke4zv.uucp>anf

Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May17.141704.9374@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)  
writes:

>No, I'm not saying that at all. What I'm saying is that many of the  
>amateurs \*currently\* on HF couldn't pass the code test at their license  
>class speed anymore.

Like most manual skills, however, it has been shown that it's very easily  
reacquired. Also, the tests today are much easier; you're not sweating

bullets over one minute of perfect copy.

>That crowding could lead to innovative new techniques for sharing HF  
>spectrum, or it could degenerate into on air flame wars. I prefer to  
>view the former as worth any of the latter that may occur.

Problem is, the service has to be justified to the ITU every few years, and  
a few more of those flame wars could do the service in. Nothing is stopping  
you from developing those techniques right now, especially with an  
Experimental Service license.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."  
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, \_A Nation of Victims\_

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #147

\*\*\*\*\*